

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the Section 101 rejection of this claim is moot.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made “obvious” by Sehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,658) in view of Ritter (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0094829). Claims 12-14, 18, 20-22, 25, 26, 29, 30 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made “obvious” by Ritter in view of Sehr. While not acquiescing in these rejections or in the characterizations of the references made in the office action, independent claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 31-35 have each been amended to incorporate features based on now-canceled claim 21. Conforming amendments and other amendments of a formal nature have also been made to certain claims. The discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Applicant notes that the office action sets forth no rejection of claim 11.

Independent claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 31-35 each specifies that the server performs information communication with an information communication apparatus outside a vehicle and forwards information, processed by a portable display device (or information terminal), to the information communication apparatus outside the vehicle.

The 12/07/09 office action contends that Figure 3 of Ritter shows an external communication section for performing communications with an information communication apparatus outside the vehicle. See 12/07/09 office action, page 46 (discussion regarding claim 21). The 12/07/09 office action also contends that the radio receiver disclosed in Ritter corresponds to an external communication section. See 12/07/09 office action, page 47 (discussion regarding claim 20).

However, neither of these discussions addresses the “forwarding” feature of claim 21 and the office action does not identify where in the proposed Sehr-Ritter or Ritter-Sehr combinations this feature can be found. Consequently, the office action does not set forth a proper basis for the

rejection of claim 21, the features of which are now incorporated into independent claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 31-35.

With respect to Figure 3 and the related description, Ritter discloses that the radio receiver can receive and broadcast television programs to passengers, as noted in the office action. However, Figure 3 of Ritter et al. shows nothing more than an example of such a receiver and Ritter does not disclose or suggest, for example, that this receiver forwards information, processed by the portable display device (or information terminal), to an information communication apparatus outside the vehicle as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 31-35. Consequently, these claims and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over the proposed combination of Sehr and Ritter.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, as pointed out in prior responses, these claims each recite an information recording medium issuing apparatus which issues an information recording medium storing or recording a using condition. Neither Sehr nor Ritter discloses issuing an information recording medium. The 12/07/09 office action repeats the prior rejection of these claims, but provides no response to the arguments presented by applicant. Applicant again respectfully submits that the applied references are deficient with respect to issuing an information recording medium as set forth in claims 23 and 24 and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 25 and 29, the proposed combination of Sehr and Ritter does not result in “deleting” as set forth in these claims. The office action does not identify any portion of these documents which allegedly show this feature, but again repeats the prior assertion that “memory is always fragmented for saving resources.” It is not clear how this statement relates to the features of claims 25 and 29 and Applicant submits that the office action fails to set forth a legally proper basis for the rejection of these claims as allegedly being obvious.

With respect to claim 6, the office action combines Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,069) with Sehr and Ritter. Among other things, Tanaka et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sehr and Ritter with respect to claim 1, from which claim 6 depends.

NII, Y. et al.
Appl. No. 10/006,246
Response to Office Action dated December 7, 2009

For at least the foregoing reasons, favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Michael J. Shea/
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100